

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: *Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)*

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ- P020-2011-006-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: AZA-33636

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Special Recreation Permit

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T3S, R1E Sec 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34; T4S, R1E Sec 2, 11, 12, 13

APPLICANT (if any): Wayward Wind, Inc.

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures
Wayward Wind, Inc., an existing Special Recreation Permit holder, proposes to conduct motorized commercial jeep tours and cookouts in the Lower Sonoran Field Office area. Tours will be conducted on existing primitive routes departing from State Highway 238 at Enid, AZ and extending approximately 13 miles in and around the Sevenmile Mountain and to the boundary of the the Gila River Indian Community (T.3S, R.1 E. Section 24. Tours are estimated to consist of two vehicles once a month with an average number of three to six clients. Guides will provide interpretation of the flora, fauna, geology, cultural, and history of the area. Gas, charcoal and wood stoves will be used with cooks having a valid food handler's card. Porta-johns will be available for clients. No overnight camping is proposed and all trash will be hauled out. All guides will possess first aid/CPR training, first aid kits, cellular phones and fire extinguishers. Tread Lightly! Principles will be practiced.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: The proposed action is in conformance with the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS; Approved Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and the Lower Gila South RMP and Decision Record

Date Approved/Amended: *June, 1988, July, 2005*

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Lower Gila South RMP/EIS; Approved Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Plan and the Lower Gila South RMP and Decision Record; June, 1988, July, 2005

“Special Recreation Permits for Commercial Recreation Activities on Public Lands in Arizona” – EA No. AZ-931-93-001, August, 1993. This document analyzed the environmental effects of commercial recreation permitting on public lands in Arizona, and established a standard set of “Arizona BLM stipulations for commercial special recreation permits.” The stipulations were designed to protect the lands or resources involved, reduce user conflicts, and minimize health and safety hazards, and are made part of the permit.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes, the proposed action is substantially the same as the action analyzed in the previous environmental assessment. The impacts for the proposed action are essentially the same as analyzed in previous documents and resource conditions are sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes, the range of alternatives in the above referenced environmental document is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action. No new alternatives or concerns have been presented by the public, other agencies, or resource specialists.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Yes, the analysis in the above referenced environmental assessments is adequate given information currently available. The current situation concludes that no new

information or circumstances would substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action. In addition, it has been determined by resource specialists that the proposed action will not have a direct or indirect impact on energy development, production, supply and/or distribution. There are no known planned or proposed energy developments and no such applications have been received by the LSFO.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Direct and indirect impacts as well as cumulative effects are substantially unchanged from those identified in the above referenced environmental assessment.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

External public involvement and interagency review for the above referenced EA is adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Andrea Felton	Range Con	Range Program
Steve Bird	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife/Biological Program
Cheryl Blanchard	Archaeologist	Cultural Program
Jack Ragsdale	Recreation Planner	Recreation Program

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents

CONCLUSION:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

_____/s/_____
Jack Ragsdale

_____/s/_____
Leah Baker

_____/s/_____
Emily H. Garber

03/21/2011
Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.